

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9

10 IN RE: BEXTRA AND CELEBREX
11 MARKETING SALES PRACTICES AND
12 PRODUCT LIABILITY LITIGATION,
13 _____/

CASE NO. 05-1699 CRB

MDL No. 1699 CRB

**ORDER RE JUNE 29, 2009 and JUNE
30, 2009 SUBMISSIONS**

14 *This document relates to:*

15 Edward Earl Thomas, 06-3674 CRB
16 _____/

17 The Court received on June 29, 2009 four new letters from pro se plaintiff Edward
18 Earl Thomas. The first, captioned both “Supplemental Brief Appeal De No Vo and
19 Emergency/Appeal” and “Last Will and Testament,” appears to be Plaintiff’s will. This filing
20 is beyond the scope of Plaintiff’s suit against Pfizer, Inc. The second, captioned both
21 “Supplemental Brief Appeal De No Vo and Emergency” and “Motion for Opposition,”
22 continues to ask this Court to send him materials (an application for appointment of counsel,
23 third-party petitions, etc.) that the Court cannot provide to him. The third, captioned both
24 “Supplemental Brief Appeal De No Vo and Emergency” and “Motion for
25 Objection/Appeal,” challenges the conditions of Plaintiff’s incarceration in Michigan.
26 Again, this is beyond the scope of Plaintiff’s suit against Pfizer, Inc.; if Plaintiff wishes to
27 challenge these conditions, he may do so in an appropriate forum.

28 The fourth document received June 29, 2009, though captioned both “Supplemental
Brief Appeal De No Vo and Emergency” and “Motion on Opposition/Appeal,” appears

1 related to Plaintiff's suit against Pfizer, Inc., and attaches a Docket Data Sheet from that case.
2 The Court will take this filing into consideration.

3 The Court also received on June 30, 2009 a collection of documents from Plaintiff,
4 captioned "Supplemental Brief Appeal De No Vo Emergency Response Notice of Appeal"
5 and also "Motion on Third-Party," "Notice of Time Violations/Objection/Bias," and "Motion
6 on Principal Brief." In these documents, Plaintiff complains among other things about mail
7 fraud, being denied legal materials (Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, etc.), a violation of his
8 right to a speedy trial, hate crimes, and "Third-party (law students white, colored, and or
9 oriental womens)." The Court cannot understand these filings, and notes again that these
10 matters are beyond the scope of Plaintiff's suit against Pfizer, Inc.

11 To the extent Plaintiff has made a motion to this Court it is DENIED.

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13 Dated: June 30, 2009



14 CHARLES R. BREYER
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28